



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/764,769	01/16/2001	Laszlo Etteto	G&C 30074.29-US-II	7445
22462	7590	07/14/2004	EXAMINER	
GATES & COOPER LLP HOWARD HUGHES CENTER 6701 CENTER DRIVE WEST, SUITE 1050 LOS ANGELES, CA 90045			JACKSON, JENISE E	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2131	

DATE MAILED: 07/14/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Advisory Action</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/764,769	<b>Applicant(s)</b> ELTETO ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Jenise E Jackson	<b>Art Unit</b> 2131	

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED                      FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
- (c) ☒ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☒ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-23.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
10. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: First, the Applicant states that the Rallis reference is not directed to a system preventing unauthorized use of a token, but rather, a system that uses a token to prevent unauthorized use of computer. The Examiner disagrees. Although, Rallis does disclose preventing an unauthorized user to use a computer. Rallis also discloses that the key device(20) is used in conjunction with the computer in order to validate the user to perform operations(see col. 2, lines 45-67).

Second, the Applicant states that Rallis does not disclose receiving a first message transmitted from a host processing device and addressed to a pin entry device according to a usb protocol. The Examiner disagrees. Rallis discloses this because a user is prompted to connect a key device(20) to the computer and the user transmits the pin to the notebook computer via the usb protocol(see col. 1, lines 49-54, see fig. 1A, sheet 1, #14, col. 2, lines 35-47). Further, the Applicant is urged to show the Examiner where in the Rallis reference shows the user inputting the pin using a laptop.

Third, the Applicant states that Rallis does not disclose transmitting a second message including at least a portion of the first message and the pin from the pin entry device to the token. The Examiner disagrees that Pin is transmitted in a second message, because Rallis discloses messages are transmitted to and from the key device(20) and the notebook computer(see col. 2, lines 48-60).

The Applicant states that Rallis does not inherently disclose a usb hub because it has a usb port. The Examiner disagrees with the Applicant. Further, proof has been provided that indicates a system that has a usb port has a usb hub. The Applicant is urged to look at Miller for support of a usb port having a usb hub(see col. 1, lines 60-67, col. 2, lines 1-2).

The Applicant states that Rallis does not disclose a pin entry device having a decryption module for decoding the message. Rallis discloses that there is a matching decrypted pin, thus the pin that is entered is encrypted. Further, Rallis also discloses an encryption key that has a corresponding decryption key(see col. 1, lines 49-64).

Rallis does disclose transmitting messages(see col. 1, lines 49-67, col. 2, lines 48-60). The key device and the computer transmit and receive messages that includes the pin. The limitation of the hub has already been addressed(see above).

#### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jenise E Jackson whose telephone number is (703) 306-0426. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th (6:00 a.m. - 3:30 p.m.) alternate Friday's. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on (703) 305-9648. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 305-0040 for regular communications and (703) 308-6306 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

\*\*\*



AYAZ SHEIKH

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

BEST AVAILABLE COPY